Defendants.

28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24

25

26

27

28

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION OF PATRICIA L. HOUGH TO REMOVE DEFAULT OF SARAH WEINSTEIN, RACHAEL SILVER, DIEDRE MOORE AND THOMAS MOORE, M.D. AND IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S CROSS-MOTION FOR COSTS AND FEES AND FOR ORDER REQUIRING ATTORNEY REINMILLER TO SERVE AS AAIMG DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL OF RECORD

COME NOW Defendants PATRICIA L. HOUGH, M.D., DAVID L. FREDRICK and ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL GRADUATES, INC. and hereby file their Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion of Patricia L. Hough to Remove Default of Sarah Weinstein, Rachael Silver, Diedre Moore and Thomas Moore, M.D. and in Opposition to Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for Costs and Fees and for Order Requiring Attorney Reinmiller to Serve as AAIMG Defendants' Counsel of Record as follows:

ARGUMENT

Based On Plaintiff's Pleadings Patricia Hough Properly Answered On Behalf I. Of The AAIMG Defendants.

At issue is whether this Court should remove the default entered against Defendants Sarah Weinstein, Richard Silver, Diedre Moore and Thomas Moore, M.D. ("the Fictitious Individuals.") The Amended Complaint specifically alleges that Sarah Weinstein, Richard Silver, Diedre Moore and Thomas Moore, M.D. are fictitious. (Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 12, 52, 54, 55, 65.) Plaintiff could not have expected an answer from or a valid judgment against defendants it alleges are fictitious. This is not the situation where the parties are "Jane or John Does," because they are 221 VERSON, TAYILOR MAGATION SEINE & SIANDERS unknown; these parties are allegedly fictitious and are alleged not to exist. Individuals who do not exist obviously cannot file an answer and a judgment against them would be a nullity since they do not exist.

While Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Patricia Hough, David Fredrick and/or Pankaj Desai created the Fictitious Individuals (Amended Complaint at ¶ 12), at this time only Defendant Hough has filed an answer. Fredrick and Desai filed motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction

1

6 7

9

8

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

23

24 25

26

27

28

which are pending and as a result have not answered. Patricia Hough appropriately answered the allegations against the Fictitious Individuals because she is the only person who currently faces liability based upon the claims against the Fictitious Individuals given the state of the pleadings at this point.

In their opposition to remove the default, Plaintiff claims that Hough lacks standing to answer on behalf of the Fictitious Individuals and to move to remove the default. However, as an alleged alter ego, Patricia Hough stands to be liable for damages if the Fictitious Individuals are held liable and she is found to be their creator and alter ego. Thus, Hough clearly had standing to answer and to move to remove the default because it was essential for her to answer on behalf of the Fictitious Individuals to avoid the potentially negative ramifications on her of a default against them.

This is also not a situation where a party is answering solely on behalf of another party to preserve that party's rights as argued by Plaintiff. Rather Hough is answering to protect her own rights because she allegedly created the Fictitious Individuals and if she is found to have done so she could be responsible for any judgment against them.

II. Attorney Reinmiller Should Not Be Required To Represent The **Interest Of The Fictitious Individuals.**

As established by the affidavit of Attorney Reinmiller, he has never spoken with or been in contact with the so-called Fictitious Individuals. Even if they exist, which plaintiff claims is not the 22 Verse they have never contacted him to represent them. He has never agreed to represent them. He has never appeared on their behalf nor agreed to appear on their behalf and he does not want to represent them. Because he has never been in contact with any of them, he has never been able to determine if representing each or any of them would create a conflict of interest with his clients Hough and AAIMG. Cf. Hernandez v. State, 619 P.2d 1214 (Nev. 1980).

Attorney Reinmiller filed an answer on behalf of Patricia Hough because she allegedly

created the Fictitious Individuals and could be held personally responsible for the conduct alleged

against them. Attorney Reinmiller's representation of Hough and AAIMG does not make him the

attorney for any other individual allegedly associated with AAIMG. If that were the case, then an

attorney representing a corporation could be forced to represent each of its individual officers, in

their individual capacities. That is clearly not the law. Thus, this Court should deny Plaintiff's

allegations of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and as explained above, Attorney Reinmiller

appropriately filed the Answer and Joinder to Motion Dismiss on behalf of the Fictitious Individuals.

Since, as explained above, Patricia Hough is the only person who has standing at this point to answer

for the Fictitious Individuals, she appropriately did so. However, this Court entered default against

the Fictitious Individuals without any of the Defendants having an opportunity to be heard and that

default should be removed because a judgment against fictitious entities would be a nullity. Plaintiff

has cited no case to the contrary. Nor has Plaintiff shown any basis to an entitlement to fees and

Defendant's Motion to Remove Default is clearly warranted in law and fact. Based on the

Motion that Attorney Reinmiller be required to represent the Fictitious Individuals.

Plaintiff Is Not Entitled To An Award Of Fees Or Costs.

1

8

III.

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

///

///

///

///

///

///

20

21

///

23

24

25

26

27 ///

28 ///

	Case 2:05-cv-00848-BES-LRL Document 81 Filed 09/05/06 Page 5 of 5
1 2	costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1927, or any other rule of law, where as here Attorney Reinmiller
3	filed an appropriate pleading designed to protect his client's rights.
4	DATED this 5 th day of September, 2006.
5	ALVERSON, TAYLOR,
6	MORTENSEN & SANDERS
7 8	Mark C
9	NATHAN R. REINMILLER, ESQ.
10	Nevada Bar No. 6793 7401 W. Charleston Boulevard
11	Las Vegas, NV 89117
	Tel: (702) 384-7000
12	Fax: (702) 385-7000 Attorney for Defendants
13	PATRICIA L. HOUGH, M.D.;
14	DAVID L. FREDRICK; and ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
15	INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL
	GRADUATES, INC.
16 17	
	$N: \ \ N: \ \ \ \ \ \ $
18 19	
20 21	
	VERSON, TAYILW OR, MAGARETEN STEINER ASIA NDERS
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	